

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending applications. The Office Action dated September 28, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, independent claims 1, 8 and 11 are amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 3-8, 10-11, 13-15, and 19-23 are currently being examined. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-15 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0152658 to Ozawa et al. (hereinafter "Ozawa '658") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,062 to Ozawa et al. (hereinafter "Ozawa '062") and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0171792 to Kubota et al. (hereinafter "Kubota '792")

Applicants traverse the rejection because none of the cited prior art, including Ozawa, teaches or suggests the claimed invention.

Independent claim 1 recites a trans-reflective liquid crystal display device, in part, comprising "the backlight is disposed under the TFT array substrate." Also, independent claim 8 recites a method of driving a trans-reflective liquid crystal display device having a plurality of pixels, comprising "disposing a backlight having red, green, and blue lights under the trans-reflective liquid crystal display device." Furthermore, independent claim 11 recites a liquid crystal display device, comprising "the backlight is disposed under the TFT array substrate."

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Ozawa et al., and Ozawa fail to disclose that the backlight is a sequential backlight including red, green, and blue lamps, and a backlight controller connected to the sequential backlight to control the timing of light emissions in the transmission mode. The Examiner asserts that Kubota explicitly teaches a sequential backlight including red, green, and blue lamps (Paragraph [0089]).

But, Kubota discloses that a light-emitting diode (LED) is disposed at the side of the array substrate and light emitted from the light source propagates through a light guiding

plate and passes through optical films. The claimed invention discloses that backlight including red, green, and blue lamps and is disposed under the TFT array substrate. Accordingly, the claimed invention is different from Kubota in that the structure of the backlight is disposed at the side of an array substrate.


Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ozawa et al., Ozawa and Kubota fail to teach or suggest that the backlight comprising is disposed under the TFT array substrate. Accordingly claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-15 and 19-23 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 27 December 2007

By 
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No. 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants